

**Excerpt from the  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Minneapolis Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)**

250 South Fourth Street, Room 300  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385  
(612) 673-3710 Phone  
(612) 673-2526 Fax  
(612) 673-2157 TDD

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

DATE: June 6, 2013

TO: Zoning and Planning Committee

FROM: Jason Wittenberg, Manager, Community Planning & Economic Development – Land Use, Design and Preservation

SUBJECT: Planning Commission decisions of May 6, 2013

---

The following actions were taken by the Planning Commission on May 6, 2013. As you know, the Planning Commission's decisions on items other than rezonings, text amendments, vacations, 40 Acre studies and comprehensive plan amendments are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period before permits can be issued.

Commissioners present: President Tucker, Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh, Kronzer and Wielinski – 6

Not present: Luepke-Pier (excused) and Schiff (excused)

Committee Clerk: Lisa Baldwin (612) 673-3710

---

**7. 628 University (BZZ-5996, Ward: 3), 628 University Ave SE (Janelle Widmeier).**

**A. Rezoning:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a petition to rezone from R5 Multiple-family District to R6 Multiple-family District for the property located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council **approve** the petition to rezone the property of 628 University Ave SE from the R5 district to the R6 district, based on the following findings:

1. The rezoning is consistent with the comprehensive plan due to the site's proximity to a community corridor, a growth center and multiple transit options.
2. The market is trending toward smaller, affordable units, which is not recognized by the zoning code.
3. The proposed density is appropriate for the context of the neighborhood.
4. The proposed building could be constructed in the R5 district if minimum lot area requirements did not apply.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**B. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to reduce the minimum lot area requirement by 20 percent for the property located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to reduce the minimum lot area requirement by 20 percent for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. The development is consistent with the comprehensive plan due to the site's proximity to a community corridor, a growth center and multiple transit options.
2. The market is trending toward smaller, affordable units, which is not recognized by the zoning code.
3. The proposed density is appropriate for the context of the neighborhood.
4. The proposed building could be constructed in the R5 district if minimum lot area requirements did not apply.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**C. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to reduce the corner side yard adjacent to 7<sup>th</sup> Ave from 14 feet to 0 feet to allow the building located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to reduce the corner side yard adjacent to 7th Avenue from 14 feet to 0 feet to allow the building for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**D. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to reduce the front yard requirement adjacent to University Ave from 15 feet to 10 feet to allow the building and to allow larger obstructions (an awning, patio, and walkway) than allowed by the applicable regulations for the property located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to reduce the front yard requirement adjacent to University Avenue from 15 feet to 10 feet to allow the building and to allow larger obstructions (an awning, patio, and walkway) than allowed by the applicable regulations for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**E. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to reduce the interior side yard requirement from 15 feet to 6 feet to allow the parking garage located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to reduce the interior side yard requirement from 15 feet to 6 feet to allow the parking garage for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**F. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to reduce the rear yard requirement from 11 feet to 1 foot to allow the parking garage located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to reduce the rear yard requirement from 11 feet to 1 foot to allow the parking garage for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**G. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to reduce the minimum vehicle parking requirement from 40 to 25 spaces (0.62 spaces per dwelling unit and 0.46 spaces per bedroom are proposed) for the property located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to reduce the minimum vehicle parking requirement from 40 to 25 spaces (0.62 spaces per dwelling unit and 0.46 spaces per bedroom are proposed) for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**H. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to increase the maximum lot coverage from 70 percent to 85.2 percent for the property located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to increase the maximum lot coverage from 70 percent to 85.2 percent for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**I. Variance:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a variance to increase the maximum allowed amount of impervious surface from 85 percent to 88.8 percent for the property located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the variance to increase the maximum allowed amount of impervious surface from 85 percent to 88.8 percent for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following finding:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**J. Site Plan Review:** Application by ESG Architects, on behalf of Hupp Holdings LLC, for a site plan review for the property located at 628 University Ave SE.

**Action:** Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission **approved** the application for site plan review to allow a multiple-family dwelling with 40 units for the property located at 628 University Ave SE, based on the following findings:

1. With approval of the rezoning, the development can be accomplished as proposed.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. Department of Community Planning and Economic Development staff review and approval of the final elevations, floor, site, lighting and landscape plans.
2. All site improvements shall be completed by May 6, 2015, unless extended by the Zoning Administrator, or the permit may be revoked for non-compliance.
3. The use of fiber cement shall be limited to 30 percent on each building elevation.
4. The applicant is encouraged to work with staff to provide additional articulation on the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue building elevation.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

Staff Widmeier presented the staff report.

**Commissioner Cohen:** Percentage of fiber cement and facing materials?

**Staff Widmeier:** I do not. The applicant may have them.

**Commissioner Huynh:** At our last Committee of the Whole we had the conversation about R5 versus R6. With all the applications they're requesting on this land use application, is the trigger for going R6 because the request for density? If it wasn't for the density requirement, would everything else be able to be handled as an R5?

**Staff Widmeier:** The other exception to the density is the floor area. Both the number of dwelling units and floor area couldn't be handled with the R5, although with the floor area you can request a variance and there's no limit on it as there is with the minimum lot area requirement.

**Commissioner Huynh:** But the trigger for the request for the rezoning is because of the higher density?

**Staff Widmeier:** Right.

**President Tucker:** So if we didn't have a minimum lot area variance requirement, we wouldn't have to go to R6, we could do R5 with a variance for the floor area ratio, do I understand that correctly?

**Staff Widmeier:** If they were to reduce the number of dwelling units proposed...is that what you're asking?

**President Tucker:** Suppose there were no minimum lot area...

**Staff Widmeier:** Yes, if there was no minimum lot area requirement, that would eliminate that, we wouldn't have to change that.

**President Tucker:** Then they'd just need a variance for FAR and they could do 40 units with R5.

**Staff Widmeier:** Correct.

**President Tucker:** So it's the minimum lot area that's doing us in here.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** I just want to be clear. With R5, the FAR maximum with one bonus is 2.4? With R6 is 3.6. If I understand, the proposal is for 2.76 for FAR.

**Staff Widmeier:** R5 with one density bonus, the FAR allowed is 2.4 and that sounds right that they're proposing 2.76.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** Does that include lower level parking?

**Staff Widmeier:** It doesn't include the parking. That's a difference of about 4000 square feet of what would be allowed in R5 and what they're proposing.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** Do you know what the dwelling unit per acre maximum is in R6, if there is one?

**Staff Widmeier:** I think that's in Table 7. I didn't do the dwelling unit per acre calculation, but with the numbers you could figure it out. With the R6 you can only vary the lot area requirement up to 30% so there's a cap on the density.

**Commissioner Cohen:** Let me go back to fiber cement for a moment; do we have a policy or recommendation in this area? Thirty percent is the number that sticks in my head. Is there a number that we've been using as a loose general policy on this subject?

**Staff Widmeier:** Thirty percent is that number.

President Tucker opened the public hearing.

**Alan Hupp [not on sign-in sheet]:** The issue does seem to revolve around the rezoning from R5 to R6 and that's creating a cascading series of concerns for the staff. What we were hoping to do, and it's similar to what we were able to do previously, is just to review quickly the vision for the project and how we got where we're at as well as how we approached the architecture and then speak specifically to some of the zoning concerns.

**President Tucker:** Remember, we saw this at CoW so we don't need to go through the entire presentation. We'd like to get to the arguments about the zoning I think.

**Aaron Roseth (500 Washington Ave):** We're here before you as a metaphor for sort of a loaf of bread. This loaf of bread in R5 and R6 is the same size loaf of bread. It has the same weight; it has the same density in terms of what's inside of it in terms of bedrooms. The difference is that we don't have demising walls in an R5 approvable project as you can see below. We're asking for more units. Marcy Holmes has given us unanimous support and are encouraging us to do this. They've asked us to possibly look at adding density to it from what we have. The heart of the argument is what you see on your screen right now. What you're seeing is what just was approved through the Zoning and Planning offices of Marcy Holmes. They gave us support

for what we were proposing for exterior materials. If this is a condition of approval that stays in the project if we're fortunate to have your vote of approval on this, we will be below 30% on all major facades in terms of Hardie. You're seeing the different materials and some other examples of those materials in this area. If you would like me to stop on any of these, I can come back to them. Here's a final rendering that we think is a very beautiful composition and will add greatly to the neighborhood. One of the comments that the staff brought up in terms of breaking up the elevation on 7<sup>th</sup>, we believe there's a broader context to what we're relating this building to. Along 7<sup>th</sup>, the parking garages there – we do have a significant slope from the top of University down 7<sup>th</sup> and we're trying to work with that with architecture and create what we believe is a really beautiful plinth and in keeping that a pure material. On the first floor of the building, we're breaking it up to work with the units and the lobby. These are different views. We believe this relates to the context very well in terms of the setbacks. Here is what I believe is the crux of the argument. With a technicality, we are not able to do R5. If we did R5, what's demonstrated on your screen...if you go back to that diagram I showed you from the typical floor plan to the R6 floor plan, taking out the demising walls, having the same number of bedrooms but less units and if we kept in that R5 zoning we would be coming to you asking for a 14% variance on FAR and 100% variance on MLA. On R6, the FAR is not a variance. We're asking for a 14% variance on MLA. Without going into detail of more of our reactions to the staff report, we agree a lot with what staff has written. Besides the point of rezoning, it seemed like they were very agreeable to many of the things we were asking for, but the statement with each one of the variances continue to come back to that we can't approve this because it's within R6.

**Commissioner Huynh:** I think I know the answer to this, but I just want to ask it. Just because some of these units are smaller doesn't necessarily mean they aren't going to have health, safety, welfare and fire addressed within their units. They're all going to have sprinklers, they're all going to be conditioned the same so it's not like...

**Aaron Roseth:** Correct. The only difference is they are smaller units and we're trying our best to have them feel like they live big. We call it the airstream effect of small units where we're doing built in furniture. There's no other difference in terms of life safety.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** Can you define major facades for us, please? You said the Hardie board would be under 30% on "major" facades.

**Aaron Roseth:** The one façade that we may be a little over 30% is the façade that is facing Thomas Place. Our goal is to have less than 30% on every façade. If that's a condition of approval, we're up to that challenge and will do everything we can to keep it below that.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** Can you identify what materials are what on the facades?

**Aaron Roseth:** This material here we're looking at doing cedar board, the infill between the windows we're looking to be either a metal panel or Hardie board. This is galvanized metal panel with a profile to it. This is brick. This is cast in place concrete. This is burnished block or stone; we're pricing both of them. Brick. Fiberglass windows. The black in the infill between the windows will either be Hardie or metal panel.

**Commissioner Cohen:** I take it that the decision to go from R5 to R6 in order to accommodate these smaller units is a market driven decision. Give me an idea of the context of which you make this decision in terms of the surrounding apartments and what kind of basis which suggest this is where the market is going. I'd like to get an idea of what we're talking about here in terms of economic development and not just architectural context.

**Alan Hupp:** We looked at what was going on around the university currently. The new product are primarily three and four bedroom units and they're primarily serving a relatively young underclass person. Where we saw there was really not a good solution, people told us our products geared toward an older student; someone who doesn't want to live in a very dense location and wants to live alone or in a more private setting. We then looked at what was going on in other markets. We looked at the east coast, west coast and all the rest and we saw there was really a trend towards more compact smaller units. The other thing that was going on to is by the virtue of us reducing the size of the units...and on average these are about 10-15% smaller than comparable units, is that we're actually able to lower the price. It becomes a bit more affordable for individuals that are looking to have a little more private place. The reality is, a lot of the buildings around us, are one and two bedroom units. We felt we weren't at odds with our neighbors at all. Going to a little smaller footprint was consistent with where the market was going and would give us the ability to lower the price to some extent and meet the needs of another market segment whose needs were pretty much ignored by the other new product coming into the market. That's what drove our thinking on this.

**Catherine Liska (612 4<sup>th</sup> St SE) [not on sign-in sheet]:** I live one block away from this development. We're the only single family home within a four block radius...well, there's actually one other single family home. We are happy that this is going to be redeveloped because the property that's there, it's time for it to be fixed up. We're also happy to see the size of this and the scale. What we had concern with is that when you live in this neighborhood and are on this busy street and there's this cycle and flow of students coming in and out, the one concern before we get to the zoning concern, is the parking. All the studies that we read about parking are that the students don't have vehicles and there's a lot of public transportation. That's all true, but what doesn't get taken into consideration is all of the students who come and park by our house and walk to the U of M. The people who live in these apartments quite often times can't find parking and they're fighting over it all the time because a lot of students drive in and park adjacent to these blocks and they walk to the U of M. We see it happen every morning all winter long. They bring their bicycles and pull their bicycles out of their trucks and they bicycle to the U of M. We were concerned when we got the letter because of the parking variance. We didn't fully understand that it was related to the rezoning so now that I have a better idea of that, the two concerns my husband I have are about the parking and stormwater runoff because we want to keep as much permeable land in our neighborhood as possible. I love the idea of the smaller units, but I'm concerned about rezoning to R6 even though it sounds like it's just right across the street. For us as single family homeowners trying to stay anchored in the neighborhood, keeping a garden like property in the midst of a lot of rental property which is something we really enjoy. We love living in this neighborhood. We do have concerns of rezoning happening in pockets in our neighborhood.

President Tucker closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Huynh:** I will move the staff recommendation for rezoning from R5 to R6 (Cohen seconded).

**Commissioner Wielinski:** How tall could a development go if it's built in R6?

**Staff Wittenberg:** The R6 district is the one residential zoning district that allows up to six stories as of right without a conditional use permit.

**President Tucker:** But remember the conditional use permit can be requested for R5 and we regularly grant that if the context seems right.

**Commissioner Cohen:** I'm comfortable with supporting this project for two reasons. It makes sense on economic grounds in terms of the explanation of the market forces that are at work here and because despite

the fact that this is unprecedented in that this is the first time we'd be going to R6 in this neighborhood, a community group which I respect supports it...I'm comfortable in supporting the change in zoning.

**Commission Huynh:** The reason for my support is that I think there's been a market trend toward smaller affordable units and I think when people think about smaller units they don't consider some of the grad students or seniors or people that like to live in smaller sustainable spaces and so as this conversation develops, I think because of the technicality that we can't approve it as an R5, we do have to consider it as an R6 zoning. I think for those reasons, in addition to it being on a community corridor, supports higher density. I understand some of the issues with an R5, but given developments around the university and the need for smaller units, you also have neighborhood support from Marcy Holmes that supports smaller units versus larger units. I do think that the development is appropriate for the context of the neighborhood.

**Commissioner Kronzer:** I too support this zoning change. I think as the diagram shows, this is an R5 building, it just happens to need R6 zoning to execute it. I think this is an example of getting a really good number of dwelling units in the city in a four story building. This isn't an eight story building with super high density and super high height, this is a four story building which is quite commendable.

**Commissioner Gagnon:** Could I just get a little explanation? From what I'm hearing, R5 to R6 has this ripple effect for saying no to things so if we go to R6 then what changes in all these denials? We still have to go through each one of these variances? How does it change...

**Staff Wittenberg:** Each of the variances in front of you would be needed under the R6 and they were each applied for assuming an R6 district.

**Commissioner Gagnon:** So there would still be variances under R6?

**Staff Wittenberg:** That's correct.

**President Tucker:** They would still be needed under R5.

**Commissioner Gagnon:** The stormwater runoff [tape ended]...

**Commissioner Huynh:** ...required as part of your development to comply with stormwater policies for this in the city of Minneapolis so I guess I understand some of the stormwater concerns but for each development or parcel they would have to comply with the city requirements.

**President Tucker:** Rezoning is forever and that's what worries me about these things. Suppose this project does not go forward or financing falls through or whatever. We've had many projects that don't happen and the zoning is still there with a lot different kind of a project possible. I think we're in an awkward position because of something we're always complaining about which is this minimum lot area, which I asked about earlier. Without that, we could just dispense with the rezoning, deal with an FAR of 14% - which we've granted much more than that when the context was right and then we could just deal with this in the way we'd prefer to deal with it. I understand there's this technicality that you can't get around the minimum lot area because it is there and you can't vary it more than 30% and it would take a 100% variance under R5 to get there. We have sent this message along to the City Council a time or two that we'd like to have this revisited; is that on the work plan?

**Staff Wittenberg:** It is on the work plan.



**President Tucker:** I wonder if we decide, because we like the project and trust it will go forward and this land will be developed as proposed here, that would could send a strong message because this is a recommendation to the City Council on the rezoning, that they study this minimum lot area issue with a little more immediacy I guess. It's putting us in this position where we really don't need to rezone we just need to think about minimum lot area differently and we have varied it to the extent possibly in many cases.

**Commissioner Cohen:** There's always a risk and this does require a risk on our part or on the part of a city that the project may not go forward or it may trigger another of other projects that are not appropriate and this would be a precedent all these kinds of things, but there's also a risk in not doing it too. In my opinion the game is worth the risk because I think it's a handsome building and the need is there. This fulfills the need as we see it. Markets can always change but I think it's appropriate for the occasion and I think we ought to go forward with it.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**Commissioner Huynh:** I will move staff recommendation on B, C, D, E and F (Cohen seconded).

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**Commissioner Huynh:** I will move staff recommendation for G, H and I. I'd also like to add two conditions. The first condition is for staff to work with the applicant to look at additional undulations or massing options for University and 7<sup>th</sup> and a second condition which is no more than 30% of fiber cement on all elevations. (Cohen seconded)

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**Commissioner Huynh:** I will move the site plan review (Cohen seconded).

**Commissioner Kronzer:** I don't think the first condition is necessary given the composition of the materials and the slight undulation of the lighter and darker colors, I don't think that's really required on this project.

**Commissioner Huynh:** Is your suggestion to recommend continuing the conversation versus making a condition? I will amend the condition so now we only have one condition that puts a 30% maximum on the fiber cement and then have a recommendation that allows for staff to continue working with the client on the elevations along University and 7<sup>th</sup> Ave.

**President Tucker:** I don't know if undulation is quite what we're looking for, we're looking for articulation. I think the second condition could be for the application to work with staff on additional articulation on the 7<sup>th</sup> Ave façade.

**Commissioner Huynh:** I would like to keep my recommendation for the one condition. I think after further conversation with Commissioner Kronzer I agree that the articulation is there with the materials.

**Staff Wittenberg:** We may want to also consider the standard conditions that we also include in site plan review applications. If you look at item number 5 (D), approval of final site elevation, landscaping, lighting plans by CPED and all site improvements completed by May 6, 2015.

**Aye:** Cohen, Gagnon, Huynh and Kronzer

**Nay:** Wielinski

**Absent:** Luepke-Pier and Schiff

**Staff Wittenberg:** If we could expand on the findings a little bit. I know you don't carry copies of the Comprehensive Plan with you but, in particular, perhaps the most important thing in front of us is the rezoning. In order to approve the rezoning we have to make sure we're finding it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and I think Ms. Widmeier included some policies that perhaps could be interpreted broadly. I notice that the applicant in their submittal, on page four, included some information...

**President Tucker:** I did look at the required findings as written by the applicant and highlighted a few items there that I thought made sense to be included as findings. The land use features of the community corridor and growth area all nearby converge to encourage a very high density redevelopment in this location. The existence of the bicycle pedestrian transit as appropriate transportation for high density. Diversity of unit types that the neighborhood and University District Alliance have talked a lot about to provide housing not just for undergrads in groups of three and four but for others who live near the university for other reasons. This is an appropriate area for high density housing. The actual density that this project proposes is similar to an R5 with units with more bedrooms so we're expecting it to have the same number of residents. It allows for a variety of smaller, more compact and more affordable units which is a goal of the University District and I suppose the City.

**Staff Wittenberg:** Ms. Widmeier, on your variances, most of those were recommendations of denial because we couldn't find for the rezoning; were there some that you had recommended denial of because you didn't feel like you couldn't meet all of the findings?

**Staff Widmeier:** The lot area variance. That was hinging on the fact that the Comprehensive Plan wasn't calling for very high density here. If you're finding that the rezoning is appropriate and varied height is appropriate then those same findings could be used for the lot area variance.

**President Tucker:** The other variances in your report seem like you would have recommended approval had the rezoning been appropriate as you understood it. Under the variance for the minimum lot area, I'd like to throw in my earlier comments about the existence of that requirement is hampering development of a variety of smaller, more affordable units in Minneapolis.